



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,350	08/31/2001	Eddie Drake	338528007US1	1476

28524 7590 10/20/2006

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/945,350		DRAKE ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Dominic D. Saltarelli		2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-102 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,7,34,37 and 72-102 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 64 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-33,35,36 and 38-71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed August 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, applicant argues the 101 rejection of claim 26, stating that the claim depends on claim 23, which recites a "computer readable medium" and is thus statutory (applicant's remarks, page 24).

In response, claim 23 is considered statutory because the examiner assumes the position that a computer readable medium does not refer to a signal bearing data, but instead a physical device bearing data. However, claim 26 then defines the computer readable medium as a "data transmission medium", and it is the Office's current position that a signal bearing computer executable instructions is not patentable under 35 U.S.C. 101, as per the published interim guidelines which state "... it does not appear that a claim reciting a signal encoded with functional descriptive material falls within any of the categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101."

Second, applicant argues that Brown alone does not teach the amended limitations to claims 1, 23, 26, and 31 and thus asserts claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-13, 18, 21-31, 40, and 48 are allowable (applicant's remarks, page 25).

In response, these arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection of Brown in view of Rautila herein.

Third applicant argues that neither Brown nor Rautila teach “receiving new content in response to said event message” with regard to claims 50, 67, and 71 (applicant’s remarks, page 25).

In response to applicant’s argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant’s invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., receiving new content in response to said event message) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Claims 50, 67, and 71 select content based on identified viewers, and do not recite selecting new content. Furthermore, as applicant references a limitation found in claim 1 when arguing claims 50, 67, and 71, which is now rejected over Brown in view of Rautila, selecting content based on identified viewers is exactly what Rautila teaches, see col. 3 line 42 – col. 4 line 6 and col. 4 line 36 -col. 5 line 4. Further, since the inserted advertisements and other content are dependent not only upon the viewers, but on the program itself (see Rautila, col. 3, lines 22-30; col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 6; and col. 5, lines 13-21), a change in programs viewed results in a change in the content that is selected for display to the viewer based on the event message reported indicating the new program being watched.

Fourth, applicant argues that Rautila requires the manual transmission of status information and therefor does not teach sending event message resultant from monitoring event messages from a monitoring system (applicant's remarks, page 26).

In response, the claims make no differentiation whether the sending of event messages are intended by the viewer. As noted above, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. If a users interaction with the system is an intentional upstream message, then this comports with the claim language of recognizing an interaction of interest and sending an event message accordingly.

Regarding claims 14-17, 19, 20, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38-47, 49, and 65, applicant refers back to the arguments addressed above (applicant's remarks, pages 26-27).

Lastly, the examiner's usage of Official Notice in the previous action was not traversed by applicant, and is thus taken as an admission of the facts herein, see MPEP 2144.03.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 84 objected to because of the following informalities: The status identifier is missing. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Data signals, *per se*, are not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, and thus not directed towards statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-14, 16-18, 21, 22, 48, 50-63, and 66-71, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (5,857,190, of record) in view of Rautila et al. (6,918,131, of record) [Rautila].

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 23-31, Brown discloses a method (performed by a computing device with a memory for storing instructions for executing said method, see fig. 1) in a set top box that assists in presenting content to viewers,

Art Unit: 2623

the method providing information about interactions with the viewers (col. 2, lines 20-35), comprising:

monitoring received input from the viewers (col. 5, lines 9-29); and

in response to detecting that the received input is an interaction of a type of interest (col. 5, lines 43-50), sending an event message to an event server (col. 5, lines 30-42), the event message identifying the type of the detected interaction and an indication of the set top box (the `lpszSource` and `fwType` parameters in the event message specify the source and type, respectively, of the message, see table 1 in col. 10).

Brown fails to disclose receiving new content responsive to the event message.

In an analogous art, Rautila teaches a television distribution system that provides content based upon the detected viewing of programs by viewers (customizing information in the form of advertisements, col. 3, lines 22-30, are provided to viewer upon detection of which program the viewer is watching, col. col. 3, lines 42-60), providing the benefit of targeted advertising (col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 6).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown to include providing content to viewers from content providers based upon the detected viewing of programs by viewers, as taught by Rautila, for the benefit of displaying targeted, and thus more effective, advertising to viewers. The detected viewing of programs which

triggers the delivery of new content is indicated by the detected interactions that are reported to the headend as described in the method taught by Brown, as an event message which indicates a change in content would correspondingly initiate the transmission of new content (such as new advertisements) based upon the new program reported as being displayed.

Regarding claim 4, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the sending of the event message is performed in real time (Brown, col. 7, lines 54-67).

Regarding claim 5, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the event message additionally includes information specific to a current occurrence of the detected interaction (the `IpszMessage` parameter listed in table 1 in col. 10 of Brown describes the event being reported).

Regarding claim 6, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the event message additionally includes information related to the viewers (the event describes actions taken by viewers, such as key depressions made on a remote control, Brown, col. 6, lines 34-44).

Regarding claims 8-11 and 40, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the set top box sends audio and visual content to a television for reproduction (Brown, col. 4, lines 12-24).

Regarding claim 12, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the set top box assists in presenting content to the viewers by modifying received content before the content is provided to a content presentation device (the set top device controls which program or services of the received content are displayed, thus the received content is modified by selective demodulation and decoding of portions of the received content, Brown, col. 4, lines 12-24, and the set top device further modifies received content through the generation and display of interactive services, such as the interactive program guide, Brown, col. 4, lines 47-65).

Regarding claim 13, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the set top box assists in presenting the content to viewers by generating content to be provided to a content presentation device (the set top generates interactive user interfaces and displays for interactive services, such as the grid-like menu of an electronic program guide, Brown, col. 4, lines 47-65).

Regarding claim 14, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, but fail to disclose the event message is sent using a User Datagram Protocol.

The use of the User Datagram Protocol (UDP) is notoriously well known, as UDP is a nigh universally accepted lightweight standard for quickly and efficiently transmitting data over a network.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Brown and Rautila to include using a UDP to send the event messages, as UDP is a wide spread lightweight standard for quickly and efficiently transmitting data over data networks.

Regarding claims 16 and 17, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, but fail to disclose receiving a ping message (status request) from the event server, and in response sending a ping response message (status information) that indicates that the set top box is functioning.

It is notoriously well known in the art to relay ping messages back and forth between a headend and client device in a data network, as ping messages constantly inform the headend of the status of client devices, and are also useful in measuring response time and latency of a network.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown and Rautila to include receiving a ping message from the event server, and in response sending a ping response message that indicates that the set top box is functioning, as ping messages are a staple feature of data networks and are the primary means in use in industry to

track the status of client devices and the measure response time and latency of communications between a headend and client.

Regarding claim 18, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, and additionally disclose receiving a message from the event server requesting information from viewers, and in response obtaining the requested information from the viewers and sending the obtained information to the event server (such as a request for interactive voting, and the reporting of voting results, Rautila, col. 4, lines 7-35).

Regarding claims 21 and 22, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the content is sent from a content server to the set top box in a multi-cast mode (Brown, col. 3 line 65 – col. 4 line 7) or a single-cast mode (Brown, col. 13, lines 20-28).

Regarding claim 48, Brown and Rautila disclose the computer readable medium of claim 23, wherein the computing device is an Audience Tracking Server (shown as event log manager 56 in fig. 1 of Brown).

Regarding claims 50, 66, 67, and 71, Brown discloses a method comprising receiving a plurality of event message that are each sent from one of multiple set top boxes in response to an interaction with the set top box by

viewers of a display device associated with that set top box (col. 5, lines 9-42) and identifying from the event messages viewers to whom the content is currently being presented (events include information identifying their source, see table 1 in col. 10).

Brown fails to disclose selecting based on the identified viewers distinct content to be presented to the multiple display devices.

In an analogous art, Rautila teaches a television distribution system that provides content based upon the detected viewing of programs by viewers (customizing information in the form of advertisements, col. 3, lines 22-30, are provided to viewer upon detection of which program the viewer is watching, col. col. 3, lines 42-60), providing the benefit of targeted advertising (col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 6).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown to include providing content to viewers from content providers based upon the detected viewing of programs by viewers, as taught by Rautila, for the benefit of displaying targeted, and thus more effective, advertising to viewers. The detected viewing of programs which triggers the delivery of new content is indicated by the detected interactions that are reported to the headend as described in the method taught by Brown.

Regarding claims 51-55, and 68, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 50, wherein the selected content are advertisements tat are selected

based upon a number of viewers in a particular demographic exceeding a threshold (Rautila, col. 3 line 61 - col. 4 line 6).

Regarding claim 56, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 50, wherein the selected content is presented on the display devices only temporarily (the content are advertisements).

Regarding claims 57-58, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 50, wherein the distinct content is selected based on a change in demographics and number of viewers in near real time (selection is performed periodically, Rautila, col. 3, lines 61-67).

Regarding claims 59 and 69, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claims 50 and 67, but fail to disclose the distinct content is selected based on a real time change in the viewers (including demographics).

Advertisement selection systems that select advertisements based on real time changes in viewership data are notoriously well known in the art, as said known systems provide advertisement selection that is most relevant to the current viewer base.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown and Rautila to include selecting

Art Unit: 2623

content based on a real time change in the viewers, providing the benefit of content selection that is always most relevant to the current viewership base.

Regarding claims 60 and 61, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 50, including notifying a content server to send the selected content to the multiple display devices for presentation (Rautila, col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 6).

Regarding claim 62, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 50, wherein the distinct content is one of multiple different groups of content available for selection, and wherein the distinct content is selected for presentation in a manner so as to maximize revenue provided by a third party based on the current identified viewers (groups of advertisements are selected to appeal to the audience to which they are targeted, maximizing revenue, Rautila, col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 6).

Regarding claim 63, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 50, wherein the distinct content is one of multiple different groups of content available for selection, and wherein the distinct content is selected for presentation in a manner so as to maximize interest in the current identified viewers in continuing to view the presentation of content (groups of advertisements are selected to appeal to the audience to which they are

Art Unit: 2623

targeted, maximizing the interest in said content by the demographic to which they are targeted, Rautila, col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 6).

Regarding claim 70, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 67, wherein the distinct content is selected based on a type of one or more of the interactions that are not content control instructions (Rautila teaches displaying distinct content that is based on user interactions with regard to interaction with an application, such as a voting application, and not content control instructions, col. 4, lines 7-34).

6. Claims 15, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and Rautila in view of Grauch et al. (WO 98/31114, of record) [Grauch].

Regarding claim 15, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, but fail to disclose, in response to detecting a powerdown of the set top box, sending an event message to the event server indicating the powerdown.

In an analogous art, Grauch discloses an event reporting system wherein an event message is generated indicating powerdown of a set top box when said powerdown is detected, providing an indication of the status of the unit (page 10, lines 11-24).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown and Rautila to include, in response

to detecting a powerdown of the set top box, sending an event message to the event server indicating the powerdown, as taught by Grauch, for the benefit of indicating the status of a users interface unit (see Brown, col. 6, lines 14-17 regarding "informational events").

Regarding claims 19 and 20, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 1, and teaches the desirability of tracking all manner of user interactions (Brown, col. 5 line 65 – col. 6 line 44), but fails to specifically disclose the detected interaction is an instruction to change a channel or to control flow of the content being presented.

In an analogous art, Grauch discloses an event reporting system wherein an event message is generated when a viewer changes a channel or controls the flow of content being presented (page 10, lines 11-26).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown to include detecting and reporting interactions to change a channel or to control flow of the content being presented, as taught by Grauch, for the benefit of reporting user interactions of interest (a feature desired by Brown).

7. Claims 32, 33, 35, 36, 38-43, 45-47, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Lambert et al. (6,038,601, listed in the IDS supplied by applicant May 20, 2002) [Lambert].

Regarding claims 32, 33, 43, 47, and 49, Brown discloses a method in an event tracking server (shown as event log manager 56 in fig. 1) for monitoring interactions between viewers of content presented on content presentation devices and set top boxes associated with those content presentation devices (col. 3 line 65 – col. 4 line 24), the set top boxes for assisting in presented the content to the viewers (col. 4, lines 12-24), comprising:

receiving a plurality of event messages that are each sent from one of the multiple set top boxes in response to an interaction with the one set top box by viewers of a content presentation device associated with the one set top box (col. 5, lines 9-42); and

tracking audience information for the presented content based on the received event message of the set top boxes (col. 6, lines 45-58).

Brown fails to disclose determining one or more of the set top boxes from which an event message has not been received for a predetermined period of time, sending a status message to each of the determined set top boxes, and determining a current status of each of the determined set top boxes.

In an analogous art, Lambert teaches a system for gathering user statistics regarding content chosen for viewing (fig. 5) wherein accurate gathering of usage statistics is accomplished by polling a subscriber for status information (the server is seeking confirmation of an active client device, col. 27, lines 55-67) when no notifications have arrived from said subscriber after a predetermined period of time (col. 28, lines 39-59).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown to include polling a subscriber for status information when no event messages have arrived from said subscriber after a predetermined period of time, as taught by Lambert, for the benefit of improved usage statistics gathering, as knowledge of the operability of a subscriber device is highly relevant to a system attempting to track the usage habits of subscribers.

Regarding claim 35, Brown and Lambert disclose the method of claim 32, wherein the receiving of the event messages is in real time with respect to the corresponding interaction (Brown, col. 7, lines 54-67).

Regarding claim 36, Brown and Lambert disclose the method of claim 32, wherein the event messages each additionally include information related to the viewers of the content presentation device associated with the set top box from which the event message was received (the events describe actions taken by viewers, such as key depressions made on a remote control, Brown, col. 6, lines 34-44).

Regarding claims 38-40, Brown and Lambert disclose the method of claim 32, including presenting the content to the content presentation devices (content is routed through the set top box to a television, Brown, col. 4, lines 12-24).

Regarding claim 41, Brown and Lambert disclose the method of claim 32, but fail to disclose the status message is sent using a reliable transmission protocol.

Reliable transmission protocols are notoriously well known in the art, as said protocols ensure that messages arrive error free at their destinations.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown and Lambert to include utilizing a reliable transmission protocol, for the benefit of ensuring that the status messages arrive error free at their destinations.

Regarding claim 42, Brown and Lambert disclose the method of claim 32, wherein the status message is a ping message (Lambert, col. 25, lines 47-55).

Regarding claims 45 and 46, Brown and Lambert disclose the method of claim 32, wherein the content is sent from a content server to the set top box in a multi-cast mode (Brown, col. 3 line 65 – col. 4 line 7) or a single-cast mode (Brown, col. 13, lines 20-28).

8. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and Lambert as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Rautila.

Regarding claim 44, Brown and Lambert disclose the method of claim 32, wherein all information received from the set top boxes is used in tracking of audience information (Brown, col. 6, lines 45-58), but fail to disclose requesting from the set top boxes information from the viewers of the content presentation device associated with that set top box, and in response received the requested viewer information.

In an analogous art, Rautila teaches a television distribution system wherein user interaction is requested by an event server, and the resultant input by users is reported back upstream to the event server (such as a request for interactive voting, and the reporting of voting results, col. 4, lines 7-35), providing the benefit of adding user interactivity to displayed programming.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown and Lambert to include requesting information from the viewers, and in response receiving the requested viewer information, as taught by Rautila, for the benefit of adding user interactivity to displayed programming which enhances the appeal and interest of programming.

9. Claim 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown and Rautila as applied to claim 50 above, and further in view of Klosterman et al. (6,469,753, of record) [Klosterman].

Regarding claim 65, Brown and Rautila disclose the method of claim 50, wherein the distinct content is one of multiple different groups of content

available for selection (different groups of advertisements are available for different demographic groups, Rautila, col. 3 line 61 – col. 4 line 6), but fail to disclose the distinct content is selected for presentation in a manner so as to maximize interest in viewers to whom other content is being presented to select the distinct content for viewing.

In an analogous art, Klosterman teaches a system which inserts advertisements for display to viewers which maximize interest in viewers to whom other content is being presented to select the distinct content for viewing (the advertisements are for alternative content shown on another channel, encouraging users to tune to said alternative channel, col. 6 line 47 - col. 7 line 5), providing the benefit of allowing broadcasters to promote particular preferred programming over other programming a user may otherwise be watching (col. 7, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Brown and Rautila to include distinct content is selected for presentation in a manner so as to maximize interest in viewers to whom other content is being presented to select the distinct content for viewing, as taught by Klosterman, for the benefit of allowing broadcasters to promote particular preferred programming over other programming a user may otherwise be watching.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 64 is allowed.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dominic D. Saltarelli whose telephone number is (571) 272-7302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00am - 4:00pm.


Art Unit: 2623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dominic Saltarelli
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2623

DS



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600